



HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY  
Intellectual Property Administration  
P.O. Box 272400  
Fort Collins, Colorado 80527-2400

PATENT APPLICATION

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. 200208391-1

Inventor(s): Daniel Revel

Confirmation No.: 8889

Application No.: 10/629,956

Examiner: Dwivedi, Mahesh H.

Filing Date: 07/30/2003

Group Art Unit: 2168

Title: Compression Dictionaries

Mail Stop Amendment  
Commissioner For Patents  
PO Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

**TRANSMITTAL LETTER FOR RESPONSE/AMENDMENT**

Transmitted herewith is/are the following in the above-identified application:

- ☒ Response/Amendment  
☐ New fee as calculated below  
☒ No additional fee  
☐ Other \_\_\_\_\_

- ☐ Petition to extend time to respond  
☐ Supplemental Declaration

Fee\$

CLAIMS AS AMENDED BY OTHER THAN A SMALL ENTITY						
(1) FOR	(2) CLAIMS REMAINING AFTER AMENDMENT	(3) NUMBER EXTRA	(4) HIGHEST NUMBER PREVIOUSLY PAID FOR	(5) PRESENT EXTRA	(6) RATE	(7) ADDITIONAL FEES
TOTAL CLAIMS	35	MINUS	35	= 0	X \$50	\$ 0
INDEP. CLAIMS	8	MINUS	8	= 0	X \$200	\$ 0
<input type="checkbox"/> FIRST PRESENTATION OF A MULTIPLE DEPENDENT CLAIM					+ \$360	\$ 0
EXTENSION FEE	<input type="checkbox"/> 1st Month \$120	<input type="checkbox"/> 2nd Month \$450	<input type="checkbox"/> 3rd Month \$1020	<input type="checkbox"/> 4th Month \$1590		\$ 0
OTHER FEES						\$
TOTAL ADDITIONAL FEE FOR THIS AMENDMENT						\$ 0

Charge \$ 0 to Deposit Account 08-2025. At any time during the pendency of this application, please charge any fees required or credit any over payment to Deposit Account 08-2025 pursuant to 37 CFR 1.25. Additionally charge any fees to Deposit Account 08-2025 under 37 CFR 1.16 through 1.21 inclusive, and any other sections in Title 37 of the Code of Federal Regulations that may regulate fees. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

Date of Deposit: 03/13/06

Typed Name: JoAnn Sismilich

Signature: JoAnn Sismilich

Respectfully submitted,

Daniel Revel

By Robert C. Sismilich

Robert C. Sismilich

Attorney/Agent for Applicant(s)

Reg No. : 41314

Date : 3/13/06

Telephone : (858) 547-9803



HP Docket No. 200208391-1

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

Appl. No.	:10/629,956	)
Conf. No.	:8889	)
Applicant	:Revel	)
Filed	:07/30/2003	)
Title	:Compression Dictionaries	)
		)
		)
TC / Art Unit	:2168	)
Examiner	:Dwivedi, Mahesh H.	)
		)
Docket No.	:200208391-1	)
Customer No.	:022879	)

Commissioner for Patents

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

**RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT**

Sir:

The Office Action dated 02/21/2006 has been carefully considered. In response thereto, please enter the following election and consider the following remarks.

**ELECTION**

The Office states that the claims are directed to distinct inventions and requires restriction to one of Group I (claims 1-14, 18-23, 27-28, and 35), Group II (claims 15-17, and 29-34), or Group III (claims 24-26).

In response to the restriction requirement, Applicant elects Group I (claims 1-14, 18-23,

27-28, and 35).

This election is made with traverse.

First, in the interests of equity and fairness, Applicant should be entitled to pursue different types of claims in the present application, particularly, method and system claims, to fully protect the disclosed invention. If the restriction is maintained, Applicant will need to bear the costs associated with pursuing at least two (2) different patent applications to protect each type of claim.

Second, as is provided in 35 U.S.C. § 121, restriction to one of two or more claimed inventions is proper only if the inventions are “independent and distinct.” In the present case, the Office states that the inventions are distinct because they are unrelated each to the other. As stated in the Office Action, “[i]nventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together *and* they have different modes of operation ...” (Office Action, p.2; emphasis added). The Office states that the different inventions have different modes of operation. Regardless of the modes of operation, however, Applicants believe that the inventions as disclosed *are* capable of use together.

For example, with regard to Groups I and II, independent claim 15 (Group II) recites “means for compressing messages, and means for decompressing messages”. Independent method claim 1 (Group I) recites a method that compresses requested information and then sends it (i.e. a message) to the requestor that can be used with claim 15. Independent method claim 7 (Group I) recites a method that receives compressed information (i.e. a message) and then decompresses it that can be used with claim 15. Independent method claim 18 (Group I) recites compressing and decompressing messages that are received or sent and which can be used with claim 15.

With regard to Groups II and III, independent claim 29 (Group II) recites “instructions for encoding and decoding a message according to a compression dictionary”. Independent method claim 24 (Group III) recites a method that creates such a compression dictionary that can be used with claim 29.

With regard to Groups I and III, independent claim 1 (Group I) recites “caching a compression dictionary” for use in compressing requested information. Independent method claim